

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-13 and 15 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of November 27, 2007 all claims are rejected. With this response claims 1 and 15 are amended, and claim 9 is cancelled. Claims 1 and 15 are amended to include the limitations from claim 9. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Support for the amendments can be found at least from page 20, lines 18-34 of the specification.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 2, on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Will (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,640) in view of Dostie et al. (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2004/0021691). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to include limitations recited in claim 9, and now recites that generating the character subset with the inference logic comprises identifying a start of an entry of the new word, and inserting, into the character subject, the most probable letters stored in the database of words for starting the new word. In rejecting now cancelled claim 9, the Office relies upon Dostie to teach the limitations recited in claim 1.

In contrast to amended claim 1, Dostie only discloses that only once at least one character is entered using the character entry system (28) can the user use the character entry system (28) and search list (30) to rapidly and flexibly enter text. See Dostie paragraph [0079]. Furthermore, when a character is entered in Dostie the entered character is added to the trailing end of the partial text entry, and the partial text entry is used to search a dictionary of completion candidates for a set of completion candidates that begin with the partial text entry entered by the user. See Dostie paragraph [0009]. Therefore, Dostie does not disclose or suggest identifying a start of an entry of a new word, but instead teaches determining entry of the first character of a word. Since the first character in Dostie has already been entered, there is no need for insertion of probable letters for starting a word, as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, for at least this reason Dostie fails to disclose or suggest that generating the character subset with the inference logic comprises identifying a start of an entry of the new word, and inserting, into the character

subject, the most probable letters stored in the database of words for starting the new word. Will fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Dostie, and therefore the cited references even in combination fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1.

Independent claim 15 contains limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, claim 15 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

The dependent claims depending from the independent claims discussed above are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 20 February 2003

Keith R. Obert

Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955